

Regularizing Bayesian Predictive Regressions ^{*}

Guanhao Feng[†]

Booth School of Business

University of Chicago

Nicholas Polson[‡]

Booth School of Business

University of Chicago

First Draft: June, 2016

This Draft: March, 2017

Abstract

We show that regularizing Bayesian predictive regressions provides a framework for prior sensitivity analysis. We develop a procedure that jointly regularizes expectations and variance-covariance matrices using a pair of shrinkage priors. Our methodology applies directly to vector autoregressions (VAR) and seemingly unrelated regressions (SUR). The regularization path provides a prior sensitivity diagnostic. By exploiting a duality between regularization penalties and predictive prior distributions, we reinterpret two classic Bayesian analyses of macro-finance studies: equity premium predictability and forecasting macroeconomic growth rates. We find there exist plausible prior specifications for predictability in excess S&P 500 index returns using book-to-market ratios, CAY (consumption, wealth, income ratio), and T-bill rates. We evaluate the forecasts using a market-timing strategy, and we show the optimal regularized solution outperforms a buy-and-hold approach. A second empirical application involves forecasting industrial production, inflation, and consumption growth rates, and demonstrates the feasibility of our approach.

Key words: Bayesian predictive regression; prior sensitivity analysis; maximum-a-posteriori; equity-premium predictability; macroeconomic forecasting; model selection.

^{*}We appreciate helpful comments from conference participants at 26th Annual Meeting of the Midwest Econometrics Group, 11th Annual Economic Graduate Student Conference at WUSTL, and 2017 Vienna-Copenhagen Conference on Financial Econometrics.

[†]Address: 5807 S Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA. E-mail address: gfheng@chicagobooth.edu.

[‡]Address: 5807 S Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA. E-mail address: ngp@chicagobooth.edu.

1 Introduction

Regularizing Bayesian predictive regressions provides a framework for predictor selection and prior sensitivity analysis in economics and finance. In particular, we study the equity-premium predictability and forecasting of macroeconomic growth rates including consumption, inflation and industrial production. Bayesian methods require prior assessment motivated by economic theory or constraints, and also prior sensitivity analysis. Regularization methods, on the other hand, address the bias-variance tradeoff in high-dimensional regression problems by maximizing out-of-sample predictive performance, and we also show the regularization path of the predictors. We exploit a duality between Bayesian predictive regressions and regularization, which leads to a framework of prior sensitivity analysis.

Bayesian methods have become increasingly popular as a solution (see [Koop and Korobilis \(2010\)](#)) to the over-parameterization issue in VAR (vector auto-regression) and SUR (seemingly unrelated regression) systems. Bayesian studies either require subjective prior specifications to perform sensitivity analysis or computationally intensive simulation methods such as Markov-chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. Consequently, performing prior sensitivity analysis across a wide range of prior hyperparameters at a low computational cost is essential. A significant contribution of our paper is the introduction of fast and scalable convex optimization algorithms to perform prior sensitivity analysis for prior hyperparameters and search a data-driven “optimal” specification.

Our methodology jointly regularizes expected values and variance-covariance matrices in VAR and SUR systems. By exploiting a fundamental duality between maximum-a-posteriori (MAP) estimation and regularization estimators, we reinterpret Bayesian studies of the equity-premium predictability, see [Kandel and Stambaugh \(1996\)](#) and [Barberis \(2000\)](#), and forecasting macroeconomic growth rates, see [Stock and Watson \(2002, 2012\)](#). The particular attention is on the sensitivity analysis of a univariate outcome prediction over a wide range of prior hyperparameters in a high-dimensional VAR model.

Our approach addresses a problem of [Cogley, Colacito, Hansen, and Sargent \(2008\)](#), who show that many macro-forecasting findings are sensitive to prior initial beliefs. [Hansen and Sargent \(2010\)](#) also discuss “fragile beliefs” and a representative consumer’s fear of misspecification fosters pessimism that puts countercyclical uncertainty premia into risk prices. Another comprehensive

empirical study is [Carriero, Clark, and Marcellino \(2015\)](#), who investigate how prior specification choices affect the point and density forecasting performance of Bayesian VARs. [Müller \(2012\)](#) derives measures of prior sensitivity and prior informativeness that account for the high-dimensional interaction between prior and likelihood information.

Our methodology leads to computational advantages over traditional MCMC approaches because of the fact that we use fast scalable convex optimization algorithms. Rather than marginalizing out prior hyperparameters in a fully Bayesian analysis, we calibrate hyperparameters using an economically meaningful predictive cross-validation measure given a univariate target. To learn about interaction effects of multiple shocks, we propose a Lasso-tilted inverse Wishart prior to introduce sparsity in the variance-covariance matrix. We develop a proximal algorithm using majorize-minimize operations (see [Polson, Scott, and Willard \(2015\)](#) and [Bien and Tibshirani \(2011\)](#)) to provide a simple alternative to MCMC simulation (see [Chan, Eisenstat, and Koop \(2016\)](#) and [Johannes and Polson \(2009, 2010\)](#)) for high-dimensional VAR and SUR systems.

The rest of the paper is outlined as follows. Section [\(1.1\)](#) provides the intuition behind the connection between prior sensitivity analysis and model regularization, and section [\(1.2\)](#) completes the review of related works of literature. Section [\(2\)](#) presents the regularized system for Bayesian VAR and SUR, as well as a discussion of the Bayesian MAP estimator. Section [\(3\)](#) develops a proximal algorithm for both auto-regressive coefficients and variance-covariance matrices within a VAR setting. Section [\(4.1\)](#) illustrates our method by revisiting the equity-premium analysis of [Barberis \(2000\)](#) and [Kandel and Stambaugh \(1996\)](#), who show evidence of return predictability using predictive variables; see [Welch and Goyal \(2008\)](#). Section [\(4.2\)](#) provides a second empirical study in macroeconomic forecasting using a well-known dataset from [Stock and Watson \(2012\)](#), and provides insights beyond those provided by regular VARs. Finally, section [\(5\)](#) concludes with directions for future research.

1.1 Prior Sensitivity and Regularization

Define B as an auto-regressive coefficient in a VAR(1) model, and Σ as a variance-covariance matrix for multiple shocks. Statistical regularization requires a researcher to specify a measure of goodness of fit, denoted by $l(B, \Sigma)$, as well as a penalty function that achieves a parsimonious

model, denoted by $\phi(B, \Sigma)$. Probabilistically, $l(B, \Sigma)$ and $\phi(B, \Sigma)$ correspond to the negative logarithms of the likelihood and a prior distribution. Therefore, a regularization estimation leads to such an optimization problem

$$\min_{B, \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^d} l(B, \Sigma) + \phi(B, \Sigma).$$

For example, a regularized regression minimizes a least-squares objective (Gaussian likelihood) plus a penalty such as an L^2 -norm (Ridge) Gaussian probability model or L^1 -norm (Lasso) double exponential probability model.

A probabilistic approach, on the other hand, leads to a Bayesian hierarchical model

$$p(y \mid B, \Sigma) \propto \exp\{-l(B, \Sigma)\}, \quad p(B, \Sigma) \propto \exp\{-\phi(B, \Sigma)\}.$$

The solution to the minimization problem corresponds to maximizing the posterior density,

$$p(B, \Sigma \mid y) \propto p(y \mid B, \Sigma) \times p(B, \Sigma) = \exp\{-l(B, \Sigma) - \phi(B, \Sigma)\}$$

$$(\hat{B}, \hat{\Sigma}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{B, \Sigma} p(B, \Sigma \mid y),$$

where $p(B, \Sigma \mid y)$ denotes the posterior distribution. $(\hat{B}, \hat{\Sigma})$ is the posterior mode.

If $\phi(B, \Sigma) = \lambda\phi_1(B) + \gamma\phi_2(\Sigma)$, then λ and γ are hyperparameters of a prior distribution and tuning parameters in a regularization problem. Whereas a Bayesian study requires a prior distribution and is sensitive to its hyperparameters (λ, γ) , a regularization problem uses (λ, γ) to control the bias-variance tradeoff of the model complexity. Consequently, the regularized estimates $(\hat{B}, \hat{\Sigma})_{(\lambda, \gamma)}$ provide a regularization path, which can be interpreted as prior sensitivity analysis for the MAP estimator. Therefore, the pair of λ and γ is the key to connect the interpretation of prior sensitivity analysis and model regularization.

1.2 Connection with Empirical Macro-Finance

[Giannone, Lenza, and Primiceri \(2015\)](#) further consider the hyperparameter uncertainty and take an explicit hierarchical modeling approach to evaluate the density forecasts of a VAR model. Similarly to applying prediction selection in a large VAR to reduce estimation uncertainty, they

also use informative priors to shrink the richly parameterized unrestricted model and reduce prediction errors. Whereas [Carriero, Kapetanios, and Marcellino \(2012\)](#) use a large BVAR to forecast the term structure of interest rates and optimally select the amount of shrinkage by maximizing the marginal likelihood, our approach relies on a predictive data-driven selection. [Bańbura, Giannone, and Reichlin \(2010\)](#) also apply cross-validation to estimate one single hyperparameter in an extended Minnesota prior in a large VAR, but their approach performs neither variable selection nor variance-covariance regularization.

[Stock and Watson \(2002, 2012\)](#) compare forecasts empirically from various forecasting methods designed for a large number of orthogonal predictors (e.g., principal components). We follow their research agenda and model a sparse correlated variance-covariance matrix in a high-dimensional VAR model. Another influential study in Big Data macroeconomic forecasting is [Koop \(2013\)](#), who considers a range of alternative priors in the context of medium and large VARs, and finds the pure Minnesota prior outperforms others. For the recent development in high-dimensional time-series models, [Chan, Eisenstat, and Koop \(2016\)](#) propose a Bayesian approach for inference in VARMA, and [Nicholson, Matteson, and Bien \(2015\)](#) also introduce regularization to reduce the parameter space of VAR and VARX (VAR with exogenous variables) models.

A central question in empirical finance is how to forecast the time-varying equity premium. [Campbell and Shiller \(1988\)](#) and [Fama and French \(1988\)](#) provide early evidence of time-series predictability of stock returns and show that market returns can be predicted using lagged dividend yields. [Welch and Goyal \(2008\)](#) examine 14 predictor variables and find little forecasting power in univariate forecasting regressions. [Cochrane \(2008\)](#) uses a VAR system of returns and dividend growth to explore their joint stochastic dynamics and defend the return predictability. Therefore, we build on the empirical finance literature by adopting a regularized Bayesian predictive framework to exploit the joint dynamics for the univariate predictor.

[Campbell and Thompson \(2008\)](#) find an economically significant out-of-sample forecasting power after imposing economically reasonable parameter restrictions. In addition to assuming non-negative equity premiums, [Pettenuzzo, Timmermann, and Valkanov \(2014\)](#) use a prior distribution that bounds the conditional Sharpe ratio. [Pástor and Stambaugh \(2009\)](#) design a predictive system by using an informative prior about the imperfect correlation between predictors and the

conditional expected return. For sensitivity analysis of the tail behavior of the error distribution on forecasts, [Lopes and Polson \(2016\)](#) develop a particle-filtering approach for sequential inference.

Another issue that can be addressed via a Bayesian approach is the influence of model estimation risk. For example, [Johannes, Korteweg, and Polson \(2014\)](#) find statistically and economically significant out-of-sample evidence of return predictability by incorporating time-varying volatility and estimation risk. [Pástor and Stambaugh \(2012\)](#) argue parameter uncertainty also affects long-run volatility through a state-space model, and [Carvalho, Lopes, and McCulloch \(2016\)](#) show a similar conclusion can be obtained with plausible prior specifications. [Zantedeschi, Damien, and Polson \(2011\)](#) develop a Bayesian procedure for macro-finance forecasting.

Finally, our work builds on Bayesian model-selection methods. Given the extensive list of potential economic fundamental variables to predict stock returns, we consider the role of shrinkage priors to examine the model uncertainty about the existence and strength of predictors. [Avramov \(2002\)](#), [Cremers \(2002\)](#) and [Wachter and Warusawitharana \(2015\)](#) find evidence of return predictability when the risk of model uncertainty is considered. [Polson, Scott, and Windle \(2014\)](#) develop an L^α norm Bayesian-bridge regression estimator and [Lopes, McCulloch, and Tsay \(2014\)](#) recommend a flexible prior for large-scale state-space models to achieve parsimony in modeling high-dimensional multivariate stochastic volatility. For large variance-covariance matrices, [Das and Dey \(2010\)](#) present a generalized multivariate gamma distribution and discuss the MAP covariance estimation, and [Pourahmadi \(2011\)](#) provides a comprehensive survey on sparse covariance estimation.

2 Regularizing Bayesian Predictive Regressions

[Zellner \(1962\)](#) initially proposed SUR to estimate a system of stacked regression equations, which include cross-equation parameter restrictions and correlated error terms. VARs are multivariate generalizations of the normal linear model. Specifically, we have a matrix formulation for a general SUR model of the form

$$Z = XB + E, \quad \text{where } E \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma \otimes I_T). \quad (1)$$

Here $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma \otimes I_T)$ denotes the multivariate normal distribution and $\otimes$ is the Kronecker product.

Σ is the variance-covariance matrix with the diagonal elements $\{\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2\}$ and off-diagonal elements $\sigma_{i,j}$. Throughout, we use the following stacked variables:

$$\begin{aligned} Z^\top &= \begin{bmatrix} Z_1^\top, \dots, Z_p^\top \end{bmatrix} \\ X &= \text{diag}\{X_1, \dots, X_p\} \\ B^\top &= \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1^\top, \dots, \beta_p^\top \end{bmatrix} \\ E^\top &= \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_1^\top, \dots, \epsilon_p^\top \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The regressor X_i is a $T \times n$ matrix and β_i is a $n \times 1$ vector. We only discuss the case of a high-dimensional VAR regularization.

2.1 Vector Auto-Regressions

VAR is a popular forecasting tool for empirical financial and macroeconomic time-series analysis that can capture complex dynamic interrelationships among variables. [Kandel and Stambaugh \(1996\)](#) adapt a VAR formulation to investigate the predictability of the equity premium and build portfolios using the predictive return distribution. They mainly focus on the prediction of y_t and assume y_t has zero autocorrelation. Our predictive cross-validation in section (3.3) follows their framework of univariate variable forecasting in a multivariate time-series model.

In general, a VAR(p) system jointly explores the stochastic dynamics of both stock market returns, denoted by y_t , and economic predictive variables, x_t , for $1 \leq t \leq T$, where

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_t \\ x_t \end{bmatrix} = \alpha + \beta_1 \begin{bmatrix} y_{t-1} \\ x_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \dots + \beta_p \begin{bmatrix} y_{t-p} \\ x_{t-p} \end{bmatrix} + \epsilon_t, \quad \text{where } \epsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma).$$

Here y_t is a continuously compounded excess market return, and x_t is a vector of K economic predictive variables, which typically include dividend yield, earning-price ratio, book-to-market ratio, and so on. For multi-step prediction, we can estimate the VAR parameters (α, β, Σ) and iterate the model forward with the parameters fixed at their estimated values.

To illustrate the model, consider the simplest case of a VAR(1) system. Given that most predictors proposed in the literature are lagged one period, we rewrite a VAR(1) model with a demeaned

vector given by $Z_t = (y_t, x_t^\top)^\top - E_T[(y_t, x_t^\top)^\top]$ and the autoregressive structure:

$$Z_t = BZ_{t-1} + \epsilon_t \quad (2)$$

In the empirical study of section (4.1), our goal is to study the joint predictability of proposed predictors to stock returns and see the trade-off between model specification and forecasting power. To compute the posterior distribution, it is convenient to reformulate the VAR(1) model into the matrix formulation of SUR in (1), and we write $z = \text{Vec}(Z) = (L^\top \otimes I_p)B + \text{Vec}(E)$, where $\text{Vec}(\cdot)$ is the column stack operator, and we stack variables and parameters $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_T)$, $L = (Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_{T-1})$, $E = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_T)$ and $B = \text{Vec}(\beta)$.

2.2 Bayesian MAP Estimator

We now turn to the problem of computing a regularized Bayesian MAP (Maximum-a-Posteriori) estimation. With a joint penalty, denoted by $\phi(B, \Sigma)$, for the parameters β and the variance-covariance matrix Σ , a MAP estimator corresponds to the mode of the posterior distribution. The usual Bayesian estimator is the posterior expectation that minimizes the quadratic loss in Bayesian decision studies, whereas the MAP estimator minimizes the 0-1 loss. When the prior density is flat, the posterior mode turns out to be the maximum likelihood estimator.

This problem is equivalent to solving a penalized likelihood with regularization where $\phi(B, \Sigma)$ is considered a penalty function to control the favorable bias-variance trade-off. Polson and Scott (2015) describe such a duality between specifying a regularization penalty and a prior distribution. The prior hyperparameter λ can be viewed as the amount of regularization. We demonstrate that using some shrinkage priors performs variable selection, whereas λ is used to control the model size and assess the bias-variance trade-off.

Kandel and Stambaugh (1996) study the equity-premium puzzle under a Gaussian prior for B , which is equivalent to a shrinkage L^2 penalty, where $B \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2 I)$ and $p(B) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{B^\top B}{2\tau^2}\right)$. With a Jeffrey's prior, we set $p(\Sigma) = 1$ and then can obtain the L^2 regularized MAP posterior mode estimate to compare the Bayesian posterior mean estimate of Kandel and Stambaugh by finding

$$B^* = \underset{B}{\operatorname{argmin}} l(B \mid \Sigma) + \lambda \|B\|_2^2.$$

Park and Casella (2008), in their analysis of Bayesian Lasso, suggest using the posterior mode interpretation of Lasso regularization. The process of selecting predictor variables can then be simplified using Laplace shrinkage priors, where $B_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Laplace}(0, \lambda)$ with $\phi(B) \propto \exp\{-\lambda \sum_{i=1}^p |B_i|\}$. An L^1 penalty performs variable selection through the sparsity of B and the optimization problem $B^* = \text{argmin}_B \{l(B \mid \Sigma) + \lambda \|B\|_1\}$. Such a shrinkage prior is a solution to the unstable inference and inaccurate out-of-sample forecasts in large (Bayesian) VARs with dense parameterization.

2.3 Prior Distribution of B and Σ

When estimating a covariance matrix, Σ , two common prior distributions are Jeffreys' prior and the inverse Wishart. We now wish to model sparsity in the elements of the correlation matrix, denoted by ρ , as a sparse structure. The standard prior distribution for a variance-covariance matrix is the family of inverse Wishart probability densities, $p_{IW}(\Sigma)$, given by

$$p_{IW}(\Sigma \mid v, S_0) \propto \det(\Sigma)^{v+p/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(S_0 \Sigma^{-1})\right\}.$$

Here (S_0, v) are prior hyperparameters. There are a number of approaches for specifying these parameters. For example, Jeffrey's prior corresponds to the special case $p(\Sigma) \equiv \det(\Sigma)^{p/2}$. Zeros in a covariance matrix correspond to marginal independencies between variables and are desirable for impulse-response functions in VAR analysis. We will achieve this estimation by imposing an L^1 regularization penalty.

One of the main advantages of using an L^1 -penalty is that the MAP estimator, Σ^* , has zeros forced with its solution. Modeling L^1 -sparsity in Σ corresponds to adding an appropriate scale matrix and hyperparameters for degrees of freedom to get a so-called Lasso-tilted inverse Wishart density, denoted by $p_{LIW}(\Sigma)$, where

$$p_{LIW}(\Sigma \mid B, Z) \propto \det(\Sigma)^{v+p/2} \exp\{-\text{tr}(S_0 \Sigma^{-1})\} \exp\{-\gamma \|\Sigma\|_1\}. \quad (3)$$

We now turn to the problem of jointly regularizing (B, Σ) in a VAR system, which leads to a poste-

rior density

$$p_{LIW}(\Sigma \mid B, Z, Y) \propto \det(\Sigma)^{v+(T+p)/2} \exp\{-\text{tr}((S_B + S_0)\Sigma^{-1})\} \exp\{-\gamma\|\Sigma\|_1\},$$

where $S_B = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \epsilon_t \epsilon_t^\top$.

[Bien and Tibshirani \(2011\)](#) show that convex optimization with an L^1 -penalty can be applied to a variance-covariance matrix by penalizing the entries of the covariance matrix. Specifically, they show how to minimize a penalized negative log likelihood

$$\Sigma^* = \underset{\Sigma}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \log(\det(\Sigma)) + \text{tr}(S\Sigma^{-1}) + \gamma\|\Sigma\|_1 \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where the L^1 norm definition for a matrix is $\|\Sigma\|_1 = \|\text{vec}(\Sigma)\|_1 = \sum_{i,j} |\sigma_{i,j}|$. [Bien and Tibshirani \(2011\)](#) use a “Majorize-Minimization” (MM) approach to solve the minimization problem and provide a R package [spcov]. We show how to adapt their optimization solution into our joint regularization problem in section (3.2).

3 Regularizing VARs

The sparse Lasso-VAR and shrinkage Ridge-VAR are identical in model reformulation and penalized estimation via coordinate descent algorithms. Both of them can be reformulated to an elastic net regularization, which linearly combines the L^1 and L^2 penalties of the Lasso and Ridge methods. Regularization produces a convenient tool to calculate posterior modes and graphically display prior sensitivity analysis via a regularization path. The model setup below is based on Ridge-VAR, and empirical results of Ridge-VAR are provided in section (4.1 and 4.2).

A high-dimensional Bayesian VAR is computationally convenient and interpretable by shrinkage regularization. However, [Song and Bickel \(2011\)](#) show the negative consequences of directly applying Lasso-type penalties for time series without considering the temporal dependence. Then [Davis, Zang, and Zheng \(2016\)](#) use a maximum likelihood approach and propose a two-stage approach for fitting sparse VAR. Their procedure is based on the property that, for a given variance-covariance matrix, the penalized likelihood can be recast into a penalized regression. The idea is

the same as stacking equations to solve these simultaneous systems, such as VAR and SUR. The likelihood estimation of Lasso-VAR models is not straightforward, because the likelihood function involves the unknown parameter Σ and estimation of the variance-covariance matrix Σ is usually difficult because of the curse of dimensionality. We have adapted their likelihood reformulation into our regularized VAR framework.

3.1 Regularization of B and Σ

We start to assume the noise term to be a sequence of T multivariate normal p -dimensional random vectors $\{\epsilon_t\}$, and then the negative log likelihood using B and Σ is

$$l(B, \Sigma) = \frac{T \times p}{2} \log 2\pi + \frac{T}{2} \log\{\det(\Sigma)\} + \frac{T}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1} S_B).$$

where $S_B = \frac{1}{T} \sum_1^T \epsilon_t \epsilon_t^\top$ and $\epsilon_t = Z_t - BZ_{t-1}$.

Given our model specification and stack variable notations in (2), the conditional negative log-likelihood $l(B \mid \Sigma)$ of the VAR(1) model is given by

$$l(B \mid \Sigma) \propto T \log\{\det(\Sigma)\} + [z - (L^\top \otimes I_p)B]^\top (I_T \otimes \Sigma^{-1}) [z - (L^\top \otimes I_p)B].$$

The negative log-likelihood of Σ conditional on B is given by

$$l(\Sigma \mid B) \propto \log\{\det \Sigma\} + \text{tr}(\Sigma^{-1} S_B).$$

To regularize B , we add the penalty function on $l(B \mid \Sigma)$ and calculate the estimate $B^* = \text{argmin}_B \{l(B \mid \Sigma) + \lambda \|B\|_1\}$. Maximizing such a penalized Gaussian likelihood is equivalent to minimizing a penalized least-squares errors. Therefore, the optimization problem can be efficiently computed using the R package [glmnet]. Similarly, for the Ridge regularization for a Gaussian prior specification, we can solve $B^* = \text{argmin}_B \{l(B \mid \Sigma) + \lambda \|B\|_2\}$.

Similarly, we add a scaled L^1 -penalty function on $l(\Sigma \mid B)$ for the joint regularization in (B, Σ) . But we need to solve the following optimization problem, where $\Sigma \succ 0$ means positive definiteness

for covariance matrix,

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{B, \Sigma} p(B, \Sigma \mid y) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\Sigma \succ 0} \{l(\Sigma \mid B) + \psi(B) + \gamma \|P \odot \Sigma\|_1\}, \quad (5)$$

where $P \odot \Sigma_\epsilon$ is defined as element-to element multiplication and P is a $p \times p$ matrix of all 1's with 0's on the diagonal to ensure the positive-definiteness. When using an infinite penalty γ , the solution is a diagonal variance-covariance matrix with all zero covariance pairs. The optimization algorithm is allowed to regularized variance-covariance matrix, including the level of variance in the diagonal, but we only regularize the correlation matrix in the empirical analysis.

3.2 Proximal Algorithm

The goal is to calculate the mode of the posterior distribution, $\operatorname{argmax}_{B, \Sigma} p(B, \Sigma \mid y)$. Although the objective function in (4) is not convex, it is the sum of a convex function and a concave function. We can see $\operatorname{tr}(\Sigma \Sigma^{-1}) + \gamma \|\Sigma\|_1$ is convex in Σ , but $\log(\det(\Sigma))$ is concave. Therefore, we adapt the MM algorithm suggested in [Bien and Tibshirani \(2011\)](#) to solve this optimization for (B^*, Σ^*) . In short, the MM method is a prescription for constructing interactive optimization algorithms that exploit the convexity of a function to find the minima.

We now combine these two convex programming problems to construct a proximal algorithm that jointly regularizes B and Σ . We have a composite objective of the negative log-likelihood function, regularization of B and regularization of Σ . Our joint objective depends on two global regularization parameters $(\lambda, \gamma) > 0$ and is specified by

$$(B^*, \Sigma^*) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\Sigma \succ 0, B} \left\{ Q(B, \Sigma) = l(B, \Sigma) + \lambda \|B\|_1 + \gamma \|P \odot \Sigma\|_1 \right\} \quad (6)$$

by iterating the optimal parameters of B and Σ from the individual optimizations.

$$B^{(k+1)} = \operatorname{argmin}_B Q(B \mid \Sigma^{(k)}) = l(B, \Sigma) + \lambda \|B\|_1$$

$$\Sigma^{(k+1)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\Sigma \succ 0} Q(\Sigma \mid B^{(k+1)}) = l(B, \Sigma) + \gamma \|P \odot \Sigma\|_1$$

Hence, we have constructed a sequence $\{B^{(k+1)}, \Sigma^{(k+1)}\}$ that converges to the Bayesian MAP esti-

mator (B^*, Σ^*) . As we vary the regularization parameters (λ, γ) , we trace out a full regularization solution path, thereby providing our sensitivity diagnostics. [Polson, Scott, and Willard \(2015\)](#) provides a discussion of convergence properties of proximal-point algorithms and shows how gains in efficiency can be achieved with Nesterov's acceleration.

One advantage of our joint regularization is that it is computationally efficient because we divide the composite objective and conquer each individual optimization sequentially. In the empirical analysis, we need no more than 10 iterations for a sufficient convergence. The empirical results with a full prior sensitivity analysis is particularly helpful in empirical finance and macroeconomics forecasting. For example, we can learn how variable selections are performed through increasing sparsity in B , and how target-predictor impulse-responses vary through to increasing the sparse correlation ρ of Σ .

3.3 Predictive Cross-Validation

Because a duality exists between the pair of tuning parameters (λ, γ) with the hyperparameters of a prior distribution of (β, Σ) , we can use predictive cross-validation to help select optimal prior hyperparameters rather than directly marginalizing them out. Given the purpose of out-of-sample prediction, we show regularization-path plots of prediction error as a function of tuning parameters. From the perspective of predictive ability, one can search the optimal pair of (λ, γ) to achieve the best out-of-sample performance in a hold-out sample of data.

If our goal is one-step-ahead prediction of the equity premium, we can apply a predictive cross-validation to calculate the model-prediction error in history. Cross-validation is an intuitively data-driven resampling method to assess the model out-of-sample performance and is extremely useful for model selection. We can then estimate a sequence of VAR models by using a rolling window of data, and obtain the one-step-ahead prediction error. [Song and Bickel \(2011\)](#) also suggest choosing tuning parameters via a data-driven rolling scheme method to optimize the forecasting performance. For a robustness check, we have also implemented AIC and BIC for tuning-parameter selections. For the market-timing strategy in section (4.1.3), the AIC selection demonstrates strong predictability in the multiple-predictor model.

Our equity-premium examples in section (4.1) show 63 years of quarterly data, and hence we

pick the window size as 20 years or 80 quarters. Eighty observations is still an inadequate number for estimating a regular 10-dimensional VAR(1) model. We have 172 overlapping rolling schemes in the sample, which is the number of VAR model estimation. The model-comparison criteria are the sample mean of the prediction errors in S&P 500 excess returns. Other variables in the VAR system are viewed as “instruments” in the forecast. Therefore, we can find a way to determine the level of regularization with the best out-of-sample prediction performance.

In the macroeconomic example of section (4.2), we only show the sensitivity analysis, but we can use the same predictive cross-validation to determine the best tuning parameters. For multi-step-ahead forecasts, we can change the objective function to minimize the multi-step-ahead prediction errors. In this scenario, our proposed data-driven selection method is more “informative” than any prior specification that is only related to one-step-ahead forecasts. Our VAR formulation could be applied to a multi-dimension forecast by using the rest of variables as “predictive instruments” in the time series system.

In short, predictive cross-validation provides a powerful connection between a regularizing predictive regression and a full Bayesian approach. Traditionally, we specify the prior hyperparameters and calculate out-of-sample predictions, but this approach is optimal only under some specific priors. Our regularization approach demonstrates exactly how different prior hyperparameters affect predictive power through regularization plots. Specifying one data-driven prior in the Bayesian predictive system is possible. We suggest one can view a regularization approach as a quick precursor to a more detailed full Bayesian analysis.

4 Regularizing Macro-Finance Predictions

4.1 Equity-Premium Prediction

To illustrate our methodology, we revisit the equity-premium predictors surveyed in [Welch and Goyal \(2008\)](#), who argue all these predictors lack out-of-sample forecastability. We examine the sensitivity of their predictability in both single-predictor and multiple-predictor models. For Bayesian VAR studies, [Kandel and Stambaugh \(1996\)](#) provide a framework of Bayesian predictive regressions using multiple predictors and a zero-mean prior that implies no time-series predictabil-

ity and market efficiency. [Barberis \(2000\)](#) studies a single-predictor model using the same conventional non-informative prior, but he suggests an informative Gaussian prior because the equity premium should be positive.

Finally, we examine the robustness of the evidence on predictability through a market-timing strategy as one out-of-sample study: whether investors can exploit the predictability and earn profits in excess of a buy-and-hold strategy in the market index.

4.1.1 Single-Predictor Model

The dividend-price ratio is the most widely used predictor in both academia and industry. [Campbell and Shiller \(1988\)](#) shows the linearization of the one-period return that higher returns come from higher valuations P/D , lower initial prices, or higher dividends. In our analysis, the excess market return is the quarterly return on the S&P 500 index minus the short-term risk-free rate. Table (1) has a detailed description of the data and the 14 economic fundamental variables proposed by academics.

Our analysis uses quarterly data for excess returns and the dividend-price ratio of the S&P 500 index from 1952 to 2015. We use a Gaussian prior for the AR coefficient and the Lasso-tilted inverse Wishart prior for the variance-covariance matrix. The optimal amount of regularization on B and Σ is calibrated to the least predictive MSE for one-step-ahead excess returns. Although the possibility of look-ahead bias by choosing the tuning parameter in such a procedure might be a concern, we also implement a market-timing strategy for further examination.

[Barberis \(2000\)](#) uses a “non-informative” prior that is equivalent to the case of $\lambda = 1$ for B and $\gamma = 0$ for Σ in our regularization. Table (2) shows the estimation comparison between Barberis’s Bayesian posterior mean approach and our corresponding MAP mode approach. We can compare Barberis’s coefficient B and our $\beta_{[:,2]}$, which are coefficients of $(D/P)_{t-1}$ on return_t and $(D/P)_t$. First, the dividend-price ratio is a random walk in a full Bayes estimation and must under-perform the regularized estimator. Second, the large difference in $\Sigma_{[2,2]}$ is due to this random-walk specification, and our only focus is the excess-return variable. Finally, The amount of optimal regularization suggests the predictability of the dividend-price ratio should be nonzero but slightly lower.

Figure (1) plots summaries for the single-predictor model from 1952 Quarter 1 to 2015 Quarter

4. To isolate the regularization effect, we regularize the AR coefficients for the top two plots and the variance-covariance matrix for the bottom two plots, respectively, in Figure (1). The top-left plot shows how the predicted values vary over a wide range of tuning parameters. We see sequentially incorporating the belief of predictability dramatically changes the predicted value of S&P 500 excess returns for 2015 Quarter 4. The shrinkage priors allow us to observe the signal strength sequentially through regularization. The minimum values of prediction regularization are in the middle and are different in Ridge and Lasso shrinkages. The left end corresponds to a least regularized prediction (VAR), and the right end corresponds to a most regularized prediction (Average).

Figure (1) bottom-left panel shows the regularization path of correlations, and the bottom-right panel shows the regularization path of one-step-ahead orthogonalized impulse response from the dividend-price ratio to S&P 500 excess returns. When we increase the shrinkage amount γ , we can see the shock correlation shrinks to zero, but the orthogonal impulse response hardly changes (see the y-axis values). The advantage of using an orthogonal impulse response is the consideration of the shock relationship. But we find regularizing Σ has negligible effects on the cross-impulse-response function from the dividend-price ratio to excess returns.

Although our results are quantitatively similar to the full Bayesian analysis, our regularized estimation can be computationally faster than MCMC procedures. Moreover, we can easily model the parameter sparsity in our Lasso specification, and we provide full prior sensitivity analysis rather having to specify the prior hyperparameters. One caveat is we do not fully account for parameter uncertainty as in Baberis's.

4.1.2 Multiple-Predictor Mode

Many previous discoveries of economic predictors for the equity premium are in the univariate forecasting model. [Welch and Goyal \(2008\)](#) perform their influential study with individual predictors instead of a combination of all predictors, and we revisit their proposed predictors at the lens of our high-dimensional regularized VAR. However, [Rapach, Strauss, and Zhou \(2010\)](#) find combinations of different model forecasts outperform the historical average on a consistent basis over time. [Wachter and Warusawitharana \(2015\)](#) find investors sharply modify their views for predictability once they consider uncertainty regarding both the existence and the strength of predictability. Vari-

able selection is an additional insight that requires spike-and-slab priors (see [Ishwaran and Rao \(2005\)](#)) within the Bayesian MCMC. Using the shrinkage regularization, we can learn about the prior influence at the regularization-parameter cutoffs where variable selection occurs.

We explore the equity-premium predictability with many economic variables in a joint dynamics from 1952 Quarter 1 to 2015 Quarter 4. Figure (2) plots the estimation summaries of the multiple-predictor model and illustrates the power of regularization for high-dimensional data. Similarly, we regularize the AR coefficients for the top two plots and the variance-covariance matrix for the bottom two plots, respectively. The top-left plot shows how the predicted values vary over a wide range of tuning parameters. We see sequentially incorporating the belief of predictability lowers the predicted value of S&P 500 returns for 2015 Quarter 4 from positive to negative. The top-right plot shows the changes for predictor existence and the strength for the predictor excess stock returns. The property of sparsity allows us to observe the signal strength sequentially through regularization. We find the top three predictors are book-to-market ratio, CAY (consumption, wealth, income ratio), and T-bill rates.

The bottom two plots show a regularization path for regularizing the variance-covariance matrix without regularization on the AR coefficients. The bottom-left panel shows correlations between predictors and returns for the covariance matrix. Again, we can observe the shock-correlation strength sequentially through the regularization. The top three predictors that have the most correlated shock with returns are book-to-market ratio, earning-price ratio, and long-term rate of return. The bottom-right panel plots the one-step-ahead orthogonalized impulse response from predictors to returns. The top three predictors that have largest impulse response to returns are dividend yield, dividend payout ratio, and earnings-price ratio. Also, given that all impulse-response plots are flat, the uncorrelated-shock assumption does not affect the study of the impulse response.

4.1.3 Market-Timing Strategy

[Samuelson \(1969\)](#) and [Merton \(1969\)](#) find an investor with power utility wants to hold a fixed portfolio between stocks and bonds when facing i.i.d. market returns. If the excess market return is predictable, one can perform a market-timing strategy to change his fixed portfolio split. Therefore, implementing a market-timing strategy can test the out-of-sample performance of our

regularization strategies over the buy-and-hold strategy. We also provide three strategies to check the sensitivity: the most regularized forecast (historical moving average), the optimally regularized one-step-ahead forecast, and the least regularized VAR(1) forecast.

Admittedly, all return forecasts should be considered pseudo-out-of-sample in our analysis, because we recursively re-estimate the model and then perform prediction. Previous studies about market-timing strategies do not consider the impact of taxes but might consider a fixed transaction cost. We consider neither of the tax impact and transaction cost in our analysis, because we only update the portfolio quarterly and limit the portfolio change to no more than 50%. For example, I have a portfolio with value 1\$ in quarter t . The maximum change I can make in this quarter is either sell 0.5\$ S&P 500 and buy 1\$ risk-free rate or sell 0.5\$ risk-free rate and buy 1\$ S&P 500. In addition, we restrict short selling in this simple exercise.

In the market-timing exercise, we look for the one-step-ahead market-return forecast and update the mean-variance optimal portfolio between the stock and risk-free rate every quarter. To avoid look-ahead bias, we fix the optimal regularization tuning parameter that is estimated using the training data from 1970 Quarter 1 to 1989 Quarter 4. Therefore, fixing the optimal regularization amounts for (γ, λ) is one way to perform out-of-sample testing. For every quarter from 1990 to 2015 in the testing data, we use a moving training period of the previous 20 years (80 quarters) to re-estimate the regularized model and obtain the one-quarter ahead forecast for equity premium. Therefore, parameters are then re-estimated for each forecasting model, and the market-timing strategy is performed recursively.

With a maximum 50% monthly portfolio change, we update the stock-bond split to the mean-variance optimal level quarterly based on the model prediction and sample variances. We do not model the portfolio variance, but calculate the sample variance using the same training period (80 quarters). The maximum 50% change might be an unrealistic assumption, but our purpose is to adapt a smooth loss function without considering transaction cost to compare the performances of three approaches. We also compare all three strategies with the buy-and-hold strategy, the fixed-split portfolio, with the same starting stock and bond shares.

The top two panels of Figure (3) are the one-quarter-ahead returns from both single- and multiple-predictor models using predictive cross-validation. The least regularized prediction cor-

responds to the VAR prediction, and the most regularized prediction corresponds to the 80-quarter moving average. Though the range of return forecasts are mostly nonzero from 1990 to 2015, we find the forecasts are very sensitive to the regularization specification. We find one interesting pattern—that, in the multiple-predictor plot, the one-step-ahead optimal forecast has a high co-movement with the VAR forecast during the periods of the internet bubble and 2008 financial crisis. In other periods, the one-step-ahead optimal forecast almost overlaps with the moving average forecast.

The bottom two panels of Figure (3) plot the wealth evolution of one dollar invested in a market-timing strategy using three procedures. The lines are the cumulative returns for the quarterly updated mean-variance efficient portfolios using both single- and multiple-predictor models. All procedures are updated using a rolling window of 80 quarters' observations. We also plot the performance of the buy-and-hold portfolio for comparison. We find strong evidence of return predictability that all three strategies outperform the buy-and-hold portfolio.

However, we also list the portfolio return distribution in Table (3), and find the portfolio performances are very sensitive to the regularization specification. The portfolio return distributions match the bias-variance intuition that the least regularized forecasts (VAR) tend to have a large range and possibly a smaller bias, whereas the most regularized forecast (moving average) has the smallest standard error. In the period from 1990 to 2015, the moving-average strategy has the best performance in this period, followed by the one-step-ahead optimal strategy.

For a robustness check, we also repeat the same exercise in Figure (4) using a modified AIC as the model-selection criterion, which is not necessarily optimal for the one-step-ahead forecast. The penalized model size is the number of predictors selected. We see similar time-series patterns of all three one-step-ahead forecasts as well as the non-sensitivity. We also see all three strategies outperform the fixed-split portfolio buy-and-hold strategy. However, we find a strong performance of the optimal strategy using multiple predictors. In the recent period after the 2008 financial crisis, this strategy's strong out-performance supports the evidence of using some predictors such as book-to-market ratio, CAY, and T-bill rates.

4.2 Macroeconomic Growth Forecasts

We apply the proposed regularized Bayesian predictive regression to study macroeconomics forecasting. Since the seminal work of Sims (1980), numerous studies have applied VAR as the workhorse model for macroeconomic forecasting. Macroeconomic time-series forecasts are important and commonly used to inform government policymakers as to the overall state of the economy and to influence policy decisions, and thus require a careful sensitivity analysis of the forecasts.

We use the well-know US macroeconomic monthly time-series dataset of Stock and Watson (2012) from October 1959 to February 2009. Specifically, we choose 13 representative variables such that these variables represent information about the most important aspects of the US economy, and the description is listed in Table (4). To compare the coefficients in the same scale, we take the percentage change for all 13 variables. Though the target is one-step-ahead prediction for one leading variable to which the predictive regularization applies, the VAR system still exploits a full dependent structure of all 13 variables in both coefficient loadings and common shock correlations.

Figure (5) provides a sensitivity analysis for consumption-growth forecasting. The regularization path has four panels. In the upper-left panel, we plot the predicted value $\hat{y}$ for March 2009 as a function of the log λ while holding $\gamma = 0$. On the left, the least regularized model corresponds to the regular VAR. On the right end, the most regularized model compares to the historical average. We can see different values of λ lead to a wide range of MAP-predicted values for consumption growth. Any prediction of consumption growth is very sensitive to the prior specification.

The upper-right panel of Figure (5) plots the predictor coefficients on consumption growth. The top three predictor categories are price indexes, employment, and money, which are all economically meaningful to consumption growth. The lower-left panel plots the predictor shock correlations with consumption growth as a function of the log γ while holding $\lambda = 0$, where shocks to price indexes and stock price show strong positive interaction effects with consumption growth. However, in the analysis of the one-step-ahead impulse response of the lower-right panel, interest rates have a consistent effect on consumption growth. A takeaway from Figure (5) is that the regularization path not only illustrates the sensitivity of the predicted values, but also helps to identify those important signals from a large VAR model.

We also provide the same set of plots for inflation and industrial production growth rates in

Figure (6 and 7). In conclusion, these macroeconomic forecasts are highly sensitive to the prior specification through the hyperparameter λ . On the one hand, the fact that inflation and consumption growth being a highly interactive bivariate time series is economically intuitive. Inflation and consumption growth are also the largest strength one-lag predictor for each other, and common shocks to them are also highly correlated. On the other hand, those MAP-predicted values for industrial production growth are not smooth in the plot of Lasso regularization, because of these interactive effects of coefficient shrinkage. Those non-smooth points occur where coefficients of some other interacting variable shrink to zero.

In short, our prior sensitivity analysis shows changing shrinkage prior hyperparameters dramatically affects MAP-predicted values. Regularization is useful because it is more computationally efficient in high dimensions and performs variable selection. The sparse shrinkage in the predictor selection and variance-covariance matrix helps to identify those interactive variables in the high-dimensional dynamics. We suggest empirical researchers use our regularization approach as a quick precursor to a more detailed full Bayesian analysis.

5 Discussion

The goal of our paper is to connect Bayesian predictive modeling with the recent development of statistical regularization. By exploiting the fundamental duality between regularization penalties and prior distributions, we provide a MAP approach that jointly regularizes both expected values and variance-covariance matrices for a high-dimensional VAR(1). Also, we use an iterative proximal algorithm that solves two convex sub-problems on the AR coefficients and the variance-covariance matrix for maximizing the posterior mode or penalized likelihood. Moreover, for the curse of dimensionality about the variance-covariance matrix, we introduce a Lasso-tilted inverse Wishart prior for regularization. A fruitful area for future research is the study of other prior distributions for regularization, such as the horseshoe prior proposed in [Carvalho, Polson, and Scott \(2009\)](#) and [Bhadra, Datta, Polson, and Willard \(2016\)](#).

Our regularization approach offers several computational and empirical advantages, which include MAP's computational convenience over traditional MCMC procedures, the regularization-path plots for prior sensitivity analysis to forecasting power, and the possibility of building a

high-dimension VAR for the model uncertainty and feedback effects. Furthermore, a regularization penalty using shrinkage priors, such as double-exponential distribution, provides many new empirical insights of variable selection in the Bayesian predictive analysis.

However, the trade-off is we obtain only a posterior-mode prediction instead of the full posterior distribution. Consequently, we cannot directly study estimation risk from the perspective of [Kandel and Stambaugh \(1996\)](#) and [Barberis \(2000\)](#). We do, however, calibrate our prior hyperparameters using out-of-sample cross-validation to bridge the previously underexploited relationship between prior specification and forecasting power. Using the same formulation, [Pástor \(2000\)](#) find implications of portfolio allocation for multiple assets and interpret the prior as an investor’s belief in the predictability. A future research direction could be sensitivity analysis in portfolio allocation for N risky assets.

Our approach builds on previously underexploited relationships between prior hyperparameter selection and out-of-sample prediction power. In empirical finance and macroeconomics, most economic predictors lack statistical and even economic significance. For example, [Feng, Giglio, and Xiu \(2017\)](#) provide a post-selection inference method to tame the zoo of factors in the cross-sectional asset pricing literature. They also use Lasso for model selection to shrink the dimension of factor zoo. For these problems involving large variable selection, our regularization procedure provides a lens to link the model uncertainty and prediction power. We provide a new interpretation of using different shrinkage priors in the Bayesian VAR formulation as well as the prediction-prior sensitivity analysis.

When implementing the elastic net package for variable selection, statisticians usually standardized the variables into the same scale. Otherwise, predictors with higher variance have smaller coefficients and therefore less penalization. It is equivalent to set a vector of heterogeneous hyperparameter $\{\lambda_p\}$ of the “informative” prior distribution for every predictor p . In our empirical examples, we follow the economic literature instead and do not standardize the predictors to have a direct comparison with the current empirical findings. Researchers use our regularization method should be aware of this variable selection issue.

In the equity-premium prediction example, we demonstrate the change in out-of-sample prediction performance and orthogonal impulse response due to the change of specification in shrink-

age priors. We find the risk premium forecasts are highly sensitive to the regularization penalty or the prior hyperparameters in the Bayesian language. We also find significant predictability of excess S&P 500 returns only using book-to-market ratio, CAY, and T-bill rates when implementing the market-timing strategies. In the macroeconomic forecasting example, we empirically confirm the “fragile” belief of prior specification on predicted values. Many macroeconomic findings are sensitive to the regularization or prior specification. TA number of directions are possible for future research, including the time-varying specification for the existence and strength of predictors in the Bayesian regularization framework.

References

- Avramov, D. (2002). Stock return predictability and model uncertainty. *Journal of Financial Economics* 64(3), 423–458.
- Bañbura, M., D. Giannone, and L. Reichlin (2010). Large Bayesian vector auto regressions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 25(1), 71–92.
- Barberis, N. (2000). Investing for the long run when returns are predictable. *The Journal of Finance* 55(1), 225–264.
- Bhadra, A., J. Datta, N. G. Polson, and B. Willard (2016). Global-local mixtures. Technical report, University of Chicago.
- Bien, J. and R. J. Tibshirani (2011). Sparse estimation of a covariance matrix. *Biometrika* 98(4), 807.
- Campbell, J. Y. and R. J. Shiller (1988). The dividend-price ratio and expectations of future dividends and discount factors. *Review of Financial Studies* 1(3), 195–228.
- Campbell, J. Y. and S. B. Thompson (2008). Predicting excess stock returns out of sample: Can anything beat the historical average? *Review of Financial Studies* 21(4), 1509–1531.
- Carriero, A., T. E. Clark, and M. Marcellino (2015). Bayesian VARs: specification choices and forecast accuracy. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 30(1), 46–73.
- Carriero, A., G. Kapetanios, and M. Marcellino (2012). Forecasting government bond yields with large Bayesian vector autoregressions. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 36(7), 2026–2047.
- Carvalho, C. M., H. F. Lopes, and R. E. McCulloch (2016). On the long run volatility of stocks. Technical report, University of Texas at Austin.
- Carvalho, C. M., N. G. Polson, and J. G. Scott (2009). Handling sparsity via the horseshoe. *AIS-TATS* 5, 73–80.
- Chan, J. C., E. Eisenstat, and G. Koop (2016). Large Bayesian varmas. *Journal of Econometrics* 192(2), 374–390.

- Cochrane, J. H. (2008). The dog that did not bark: A defense of return predictability. *Review of Financial Studies* 21(4), 1533–1575.
- Cogley, T., R. Colacito, L. P. Hansen, and T. J. Sargent (2008). Robustness and us monetary policy experimentation. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 40(8), 1599–1623.
- Cremers, K. M. (2002). Stock return predictability: A Bayesian model selection perspective. *Review of Financial Studies* 15(4), 1223–1249.
- Das, S. and D. K. Dey (2010). On Bayesian inference for generalized multivariate gamma distribution. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 80(19), 1492–1499.
- Davis, R. A., P. Zang, and T. Zheng (2016). Sparse vector autoregressive modeling. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 25(4), 1077–1096.
- Fama, E. F. and K. R. French (1988). Dividend yields and expected stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics* 22(1), 3–25.
- Feng, G., S. Giglio, and D. Xiu (2017). Taming the factor zoo. Technical report, University of Chicago.
- Giannone, D., M. Lenza, and G. E. Primiceri (2015). Prior selection for vector autoregressions. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 97(2), 436–451.
- Hansen, L. P. and T. J. Sargent (2010). Fragile beliefs and the price of uncertainty. *Quantitative Economics* 1(1), 129–162.
- Ishwaran, H. and J. S. Rao (2005). Spike and slab variable selection: frequentist and Bayesian strategies. *Annals of Statistics* 33(2), 730–773.
- Johannes, M., A. Korteweg, and N. Polson (2014). Sequential learning, predictability, and optimal portfolio returns. *The Journal of Finance* 69(2), 611–644.
- Johannes, M. and N. Polson (2009). Markov Chain Monte Carlo. *Handbook of Financial Time Series*, 1001–1013.
- Johannes, M. and N. Polson (2010). MCMC Methods for Continuous-Time Financial Econometrics: Tools and Techniques. *Handbook of Financial Econometrics* 2, 1–72.

- Kandel, S. and R. F. Stambaugh (1996). On the predictability of stock returns: an asset-allocation perspective. *The Journal of Finance* 51(2), 385–424.
- Koop, G. and D. Korobilis (2010). Bayesian multivariate time series methods for empirical macroeconomics. *Foundations and Trends® in Econometrics* 3(4), 267–358.
- Koop, G. M. (2013). Forecasting with medium and large Bayesian VARs. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 28(2), 177–203.
- Lopes, H. F., R. E. McCulloch, and R. S. Tsay (2014). Parsimony inducing priors for large scale state-space models. Technical report, Insper.
- Lopes, H. F. and N. G. Polson (2016). Particle learning for fat-tailed distributions. *Econometric Reviews* 35(8-10), 1666–1691.
- Merton, R. C. (1969). Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: The continuous-time case. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 51(3), 247–257.
- Müller, U. K. (2012). Measuring prior sensitivity and prior informativeness in large Bayesian models. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 59(6), 581–597.
- Nicholson, W., D. Matteson, and J. Bien (2015). Varx-l: Structured regularization for large vector autoregressions with exogenous variables. Technical report, Cornell University.
- Park, T. and G. Casella (2008). The Bayesian lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103(482), 681–686.
- Pástor, L. (2000). Portfolio selection and asset pricing models. *The Journal of Finance* 55(1), 179–223.
- Pástor, L. and R. F. Stambaugh (2009). Predictive systems: Living with imperfect predictors. *The Journal of Finance* 64(4), 1583–1628.
- Pástor, L. and R. F. Stambaugh (2012). Are stocks really less volatile in the long run? *The Journal of Finance* 67(2), 431–478.
- Pettenuzzo, D., A. Timmermann, and R. Valkanov (2014). Forecasting stock returns under economic constraints. *Journal of Financial Economics* 114(3), 517–553.

- Polson, N. G. and J. G. Scott (2015). Mixtures, envelopes and hierarchical duality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 78(4), 701–727.
- Polson, N. G., J. G. Scott, and B. T. Willard (2015). Proximal algorithms in statistics and machine learning. *Statistical Science* 30(4), 559–581.
- Polson, N. G., J. G. Scott, and J. Windle (2014). The Bayesian bridge. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 76(4), 713–733.
- Pourahmadi, M. (2011). Covariance estimation: The GLM and regularization perspectives. *Statistical Science* 26(3), 369–387.
- Rapach, D. E., J. K. Strauss, and G. Zhou (2010). Out-of-sample equity premium prediction: Combination forecasts and links to the real economy. *Review of Financial Studies* 23(2), 821–862.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1969). Lifetime portfolio selection by dynamic stochastic programming. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 51(3), 239–246.
- Sims, C. A. (1980). Macroeconomics and reality. *Econometrica* 48(1), 1–48.
- Song, S. and P. J. Bickel (2011). Large vector auto regressions. Technical report, University of California, Berkeley.
- Stock, J. H. and M. W. Watson (2002). Macroeconomic forecasting using diffusion indexes. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 20(2), 147–162.
- Stock, J. H. and M. W. Watson (2012). Generalized shrinkage methods for forecasting using many predictors. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 30(4), 481–493.
- Wachter, J. A. and M. Warusawitharana (2015). What is the chance that the equity premium varies over time? evidence from regressions on the dividend-price ratio. *Journal of Econometrics* 186(1), 74–93.
- Welch, I. and A. Goyal (2008). A comprehensive look at the empirical performance of equity premium prediction. *Review of Financial Studies* 21(4), 1455–1508.

- Zantedeschi, D., P. Damien, and N. G. Polson (2011). Predictive macro-finance with dynamic partition models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(494), 427–439.
- Zellner, A. (1962). An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests for aggregation bias. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 57(298), 348–368.

Table 1: Predictor Description.

Predictor	Description
Dividend Yield	Difference between the log of dividends and the log of lagged prices.
Earning Price Ratio	Difference between the log of earnings and the log of prices.
Book to Market Ratio	Ratio of book value to market value for the Dow Jones Industrial Average.
Dividend Payout Ratio	Difference between the log of dividends and the log of earnings.
T-bill rates	3- Month Treasury Bill
Long Term Rate of Return	Long term yield on government bonds.
Default Return Spread	Difference between long-term corporate and government bond returns.
Investment to Capital Ratio	Ratio of aggregate investment to aggregate capital for the whole economy.
CAY	Consumption, wealth, income ratio

The predictor variables used in Section (4.1) are defined above. Full details of variable definitions and sources are given in [Welch and Goyal \(2008\)](#). Our quarterly data is from 1952 to 2015.

Table 2: Comparison between Bayesian Analysis and Regularization.

	Barberis		Regularization	
	a	B	β	
1952-2015	6.764e-02	1.656e-2	6.498e-02	1.263e-02
	-6.167e-14	1.000	-5.590e-02	9.591e-01
	Σ		Σ	
	6.191e-03	-1.700e-18 1.019e-27	6.191e-03	1.173e-04 6.158e-03
1986-2015	a	B	β	
	1.417e-01	3.357e-02	4.145e-03	2.857e-02
	1.293e-13	1.000	1.089e-02	9.1567e-01
	Σ		Σ	
	6.362e-03	-2.197e-18 5.110e-28	6.397e-03	3.002e-05 6.524e-03

This table shows the posterior estimates from the fully Bayesian analysis from [Barberis \(2000\)](#) and our corresponding Ridge regularization MAP estimates. The first comparison is between B and $\beta_{[:,2]}$, coefficients of D/P_{t-1} on ret_t and D/P_t . The second comparison is between the variance-covariance matrix.

Table 3: Comparison for Model Prediction Distribution

	CV.S	AIC.S	VAR.S	CV.M	AIC.M	VAR.M	Average
Min.	0.05%	-1.40%	-2.35%	-21.84%	-21.65%	-61.19%	0.05%
1st Qu.	0.78%	0.75%	0.21%	0.60%	0.20%	-0.65%	0.80%
Median	1.21%	1.32%	1.06%	1.13%	1.26%	1.19%	1.24%
Mean	1.35%	1.24%	1.16%	1.33%	1.27%	0.76%	1.14%
3rd Qu.	1.80%	1.76%	2.23%	1.82%	2.81%	3.10%	1.49%
Max.	4.71%	2.63%	4.71%	10.35%	8.70%	12.72%	2.04%
Sd.	0.85%	0.74%	1.53%	2.86%	3.54%	7.22%	0.50%
Sharpe Ratio	1.58	1.67	0.76	0.47	0.36	0.11	2.26


This table shows the empirical distribution of model predictions for quarterly risk premium from 1990 to 2015 used in the market-timing analysis. All strategies (single or multiple predictors) are updated using data from a rolling window of 80 quarters. The single predictor approach uses dividend-price ratio. The regularization criteria include one-step ahead Predictive Cross-Validation and AIC selection. VAR is the regular VAR(1) estimation, and the average is the 80-quarter moving average.

Table 4: Macroeconomic Forecasting

Category	Variable Description
Consumption	Personal Consumption Expenditures growth
Industrial Production	IP Index growth
Employment	#Employees growth (non-farm - total private)
Unemployment Rates	Unemployment Rates % change
Housing	Total New Private Housing Units % change
Inventories	NAPM Inventories Index % change
Price Indexes	CPI All Items % change
Wages	Real Average Hourly Earnings growth
Interest Rates	3 Month T-bill % change
Money	Business Loan growth
Exchange Rates	U.S. Effective Exchange Rates % change
Stock Prices	S&P 500 Index return
Consumer Expectation	Michigan Consumer Expectation % change


The predictor variables used in Section (4.2) are defined above. Full details of variable definitions and sources are given in [Stock and Watson \(2012\)](#). Our monthly data is from October 1959 to February 2009.

Figure 1: Regularizing Single-Predictor Model.




The top two plots show regularization path of regularizing the AR coefficients when no regularization is in the variance-covariance matrix. The top left panel is about prediction errors. The top right panel shows coefficient estimates for Dividend-Price Ratio. The bottom two plots show regularization path of regularizing variance-covariance matrix when no regularization is on the AR coefficients. The bottom left panel is about correlation for the variance-covariance matrix. The bottom right panel plots 1-step ahead orthogonalized impulse response.

Figure 2: Regularizing Multiple-Predictor Model.




The top two plots show regularization path of regularizing the AR coefficients when no regularization is in the variance-covariance matrix. The top left panel is about prediction errors. The top right panel shows coefficient estimates for multiple predictors using the Lasso shrinkage prior. The legend of all predictors is located in the bottom left panel. The bottom two plots show regularization path of regularizing the variance-covariance matrix when no regularization is on the AR coefficients. The bottom left panel is about correlations for the variance-covariance matrix. The bottom right panel plots 1-step ahead orthogonalized impulse response.

Figure 3: Market Timing Strategy (Predictive Cross-Validation)




The regularization criterion is one-step ahead Predictive Cross-validation. The top two panels are the one-quarter ahead returns from both single and multiple predictor models. The least regularized prediction corresponds to the VAR prediction, and the most regularized prediction corresponds to the 80-quarter moving average. The bottom two panels are the cumulative returns for the quarterly updated mean-variance efficient portfolios by three strategies using both single and multiple predictor models. All procedures are updated using a rolling window of 80 quarters observations. The performance of the buy-and-hold portfolio is also plotted for comparison.

Figure 4: Market Timing Strategy (AIC Selection)




The regularization criterion is AIC selection. The top two panels are the one-quarter ahead returns from both single and multiple predictor models. The least regularized prediction corresponds to the VAR prediction, and the most regularized prediction corresponds to the 80-quarter moving average. The bottom two panels are the cumulative returns for the quarterly updated mean-variance efficient portfolios by three strategies using both single and multiple predictor models. All procedures are updated using a rolling window of 80 quarters observations. The performance of the buy-and-hold portfolio is also plotted for comparison.

Figure 5: Consumption Forecast.




The top two panel plot the regularization paths of MAP predicted values and predictor coefficients over the prior hyperparameter $\log(\lambda)$ when holding $\gamma = 0$. The bottom two panels plot the regularization paths of predictor-target correlations and 1-step ahead impulse responses over the prior hyperparameter $\log(\gamma)$ when holding $\lambda = 0$.

Figure 6: Inflation Forecast.



The top two panel plot the regularization paths of MAP predicted values and predictor coefficients over the prior hyperparameter $\log(\lambda)$ when holding $\gamma = 0$. The bottom two panels plot the regularization paths of predictor-target correlations and 1-step ahead impulse responses over the prior hyperparameter $\log(\gamma)$ when holding $\lambda = 0$.

Figure 7: Industrial Production Forecast.



The top two panel plot the regularization paths of MAP predicted values and predictor coefficients over the prior hyperparameter $\log(\lambda)$ when holding $\gamma = 0$. The bottom two panels plot the regularization paths of predictor-target correlations and 1-step ahead impulse responses over the prior hyperparameter $\log(\gamma)$ when holding $\lambda = 0$.